

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIA SIGALA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF MCFARLAND, *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00106-ADA-CDB

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE STIPULATION TO
MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER

(Doc. 34)

On September 21, 2022, the Court entered a Scheduling Order consistent with the parties' jointly requested timeline to complete discovery. (Doc. 27). Among other things, the Scheduling Order set forth:

The dates set in this order are firm and will not be modified absent a showing of good cause even if the request to modify is made by stipulation. Stipulations extending the deadlines contained herein will not be considered unless they are accompanied by affidavits or declarations, and where appropriate attached exhibits, which establish good cause for granting the relief requested.

Id. at 6.

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to modify the scheduling order. (Doc. 34). The parties offer a threadbare, single-sentence basis for the request: "Good cause exists for this extension as the parties have agreed to extend the expert discovery related dates due to an inadvertent calendaring issue on Plaintiff's counsel's end." *Id.* at 2.

1 The initial Scheduling Order and Local Rule 144 were and are clear: “Stipulations
2 extending the deadlines contained herein will not be considered unless they are accompanied by
3 affidavits or declarations, and where appropriate attached exhibits, which establish good cause for
4 granting the relief requested.” (Doc. 27). The parties’ present stipulation is inconsistent with
5 these requirements as no affidavit and/or declaration is attached.

6 Accordingly, the stipulated request to modify the scheduling order is DENIED
7 WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: June 16, 2023


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE